United Nations S/2014/73

Security Council

Distr.: General
31 January 2014

Original: English

Letter dated 31 January 2014 from the Ombudsperson to the President of the Security Council

I have the honour to submit herewith the seventh report of the Office of the Ombudsperson, pursuant to paragraph 18 (c) of annex II to Security Council resolution 2083 (2012), according to which the Ombudsperson shall submit biannual reports to the Council summarizing her activities. The report describes the activities of the Office of the Ombudsperson in the six months since the previous report was issued, covering the period from 1 August 2013 to 31 January 2014.

I would appreciate it if the present letter and the report were brought to the attention of the members of the Security Council and issued as a document of the Council.

(*Signed*) Kimberly **Prost**
Ombudsperson

14-22347 (E) 050314

Please recycle

Report of the Office of the Ombudsperson pursuant to Security Council resolution 2083 (2012)

I. Background

1. The present report provides an update on the activities undertaken by the Office of the Ombudsperson since the issuance of the sixth report of the Office (S/2013/452) on 31 July 2013.

II. Activities related to delisting cases

General

2. The primary activities of the Office of the Ombudsperson during the reporting period related to delisting requests submitted by individuals and entities.

Delisting cases

3. During the reporting period, two new cases were submitted to the Office of the Ombudsperson. Both petitions were accepted. The total number of delisting petitions submitted since the establishment of the Office was 51 as at 31 January 2014. Unless the petitioner requests otherwise, all names remain confidential while under consideration and in the case of denial or withdrawal of a petition. During the reporting period, one petitioner requested that his name be published on the website.

4. In total, the Ombudsperson has submitted 46 comprehensive reports to the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1989 (2011) concerning Al-Qaida and associated individuals and entities since the Office was established. The reports were submitted pursuant to resolutions 1904 (2009), 1989 (2011) and 2083 (2012). During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson submitted 11 reports and appeared before the Committee on five occasions to present eight cases.

5. Since the issuance of the sixth report, six individuals[1] and three entities[2] have been delisted through the Ombudsperson process. In one additional case, a separate Committee decision resulted in the delisting of an individual[3] during an active Ombudsperson case, making that case moot.

6. Cumulatively, since the Office was established, 43 cases involving requests from an individual, an entity or a combination of both have been completed.[4] As a result of the consideration of those cases through the Ombudsperson process, 31 individuals and 27 entities have been delisted, one entity has been removed as an alias of a listed entity, three delisting requests have been refused and one petition

[1] Mohammed Daki, Moustafa Abbas (listed as Moustafa Abbes), Youcef Abbas (listed as Youcef Abbes), L'hadi Bendebka (listed as Abdelhadi Ben Debka), Nabil Benatia (listed as Nabil ben Mohamed ben Ali ben Attia) and Jaber Abdallah Jaber Alhmad al-Jalahmah.

[2] Lajnat Al Daawa Al Islamiya, International Islamic Relief Organization, Indonesia, branch office, and International Islamic Relief Organization, Philippines, branch offices.

[3] Said Yousef AbouAziz (listed as Said Youssef Ali Abu Aziza).

[4] This figure includes three individuals delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed.

has been withdrawn. In addition, three individuals have been delisted by the Committee before the Ombudsperson process was completed. A description of the status of all the cases, as at 31 January 2014, is contained in the annex to the present report.

7. Eight cases were active at the time of preparing the present report. Of the two requests submitted to the Office during the reporting period, one was made by an individual and one on behalf of an entity. In total, 43 of the 51 cases were brought forward by individuals, two by an individual together with one or more entities and six by entities alone. In 25 of the 51 cases, the petitioner is or was assisted by legal counsel.

Gathering of information from States

8. In the two new cases, five requests for information have been sent to date, to three States. With respect to the 11 cases for which comprehensive reports were submitted to the Committee during the reporting period, there were four instances when a State from which information had been requested failed to respond. In addition to the responses received from States to which requests were specifically directed, some Committee members provided information in response to the general circulation of petitions. Importantly, in all 11 cases the designating States and States of residence all provided responses.

9. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson held meetings on two occasions with officials in capitals on specific cases to gather information directly.

Dialogue with the petitioner

10. During the six months under review, the Ombudsperson interacted with all petitioners during the dialogue phase of pending cases, including through e-mail exchanges, telephone discussions and, where possible, face-to-face interviews. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson travelled to interview five petitioners in person.

Access to classified or confidential information

11. No new agreements or arrangements for access to classified or confidential information were entered into during the reporting period. To date, there is one formal agreement with Austria and arrangements with Australia, Belgium, Costa Rica, France, Germany, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Portugal, Switzerland and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

12. Further progress on expanding the list, in particular to other States often involved in the Ombudsperson process, is urgently needed.

III. Summary of activities related to the development of the Office of the Ombudsperson

General

13. Activities to further develop and strengthen the Office of the Ombudsperson continued during the reporting period to the extent possible.

Outreach and publicizing of the Office

14. The Ombudsperson participated in some outreach activities, which were again constrained by limited time and resources.

15. On 8 September 2013, the Ombudsperson spoke about her role at the Institute for Global Security Law and Policy at Case Western Reserve University School of Law in Cleveland, United States of America. On 26 September, she gave presentations on the work of the Office of the Ombudsperson at the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia and at the Asser Institute-Centre for International and European Law in The Hague, the Netherlands. The Ombudsperson participated in two panel discussions related to the "Kadi II" judgement of the European Court of Justice — the first was hosted in The Hague by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 27 September; the other, organized by the European Union, was held in New York on 1 November. On 4 November, the Ombudsperson participated in a round-table discussion organized by the Council on Foreign Relations as part of a series on global counter-terrorism strategies. On 8 November, at a seminar at University College London, she gave a presentation entitled "Smarter European Union sanctions".[5] On 3 January 2014, the Ombudsperson discussed her work as part of a panel on international law-making and the United Nations at the annual meeting of the Association of American Law Schools.

Interaction with the Security Council Committee pursuant to resolutions 1267 (1999) and 1989 (2011) concerning Al-Qaida and associated individuals and entities and with the Monitoring Team

16. Since 31 July 2013, the Ombudsperson has appeared before the Committee on five occasions to present eight cases: on 13 September, in the case of Moustafa Abbas (delisted; formerly listed as Moustafa Abbes, QI.A.163.04.); on 29 October, in the cases of the International Islamic Relief Organization, Indonesia, branch office (delisted; formerly QE.I.127.06.), the International Islamic Relief Organization, Philippines, branch offices (delisted; formerly QE.I.126.06.) and Jaber Abdallah Jaber Ahmad al-Jalahmah (delisted; formerly QI.A.237.08., relisted on 3 January 2014 under the same number); on 15 November, in the case of Youcef Abbas (delisted; formerly listed as Youcef Abbes, QI.A.166.04.); on 3 December, in the case of Nabil Benatia (delisted; formerly listed as Nabil ben Mohamed ben Ali ben Attia, QI.B.69.02.); and on 13 December, in the case of Atilla Selek (delisted; formerly QI.S.270.09.) and L'hadi Bendebka (delisted; formerly listed as Abdelhadi Ben Debka, QI.B.162.04.). In addition, the Ombudsperson provided written updates to the Committee in relation to various cases as they progressed through each phase.

17. As in previous reporting periods, the Ombudsperson and staff in her Office continued to engage regularly with the Coordinator and members of the Monitoring Team. The Team continued to provide relevant information in accordance with paragraph 3 of annex II to Security Council resolution 2083 (2012). The Team's operational support and assistance was particularly valuable with respect to analysis and views concerning audiovisual material obtained in several cases.

[5] The seminar, which was organized by Piet Eeckhout and Maya Lester and by the Centre of Law and Governance in Europe of University College London, was supported by the European Union as a Global Actor, an interest group of the European Society of International Law.

Liaison with States, intergovernmental organizations, United Nations bodies and non-governmental organizations

18. The Ombudsperson continued to interact with States during the reporting period, in particular those of relevance to the pending delisting petitions. She held several bilateral meetings with States interested in the work of the Office to discuss general issues and recent legal cases. She maintained contact and held discussions with the informal Group of Like-Minded States on Targeted Sanctions[6] and with representatives of the European Union. The Ombudsperson also met some State officials in their capitals to obtain information regarding particular cases. On 6 December 2013, the Ombudsperson provided a briefing to new Security Council members, which was organized and hosted by Security Council Report.

19. The Ombudsperson and staff in her Office continued to interact with representatives of the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force and the Executive Directorate of the Security Council Committee established pursuant to resolution 1373 (2001) concerning counter-terrorism, as well as with the Terrorism Prevention Branch of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. The Ombudsperson also met representatives of the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism, located in The Hague, in November.

20. During the reporting period, the Ombudsperson also had meetings with representatives of non-governmental organizations and exchanged views with several academics on issues relevant to the Ombudsperson process.

Working methods and research

21. As in previous reporting periods, casework involved carrying out open-source research and contacting journalists and authors to collect information on and verify sources of publicly available case-related material.

22. The Ombudsperson continued to follow developments with regard to relevant national and regional legal cases, including the judgement of 26 November 2013 in the case *Al-Dulimi and Montana Management Inc. v. Switzerland*.[7] The Ombudsperson also collected and reviewed relevant press articles and reports of non-governmental organizations and academic articles pertinent to the work of the Office. She discussed general legal issues of relevance with counsel in the Office of Legal Affairs of the Secretariat, which has continued to provide assistance and advice to the Ombudsperson on specific legal issues.

Website

23. The website of the Office of the Ombudsperson (www.un.org/en/sc/ombudsperson) continues to be revised and updated.

---

[6] Comprising Austria, Belgium, Costa Rica, Denmark, Germany, Finland, Liechtenstein, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland.

[7] *Al-Dulimi and Montana Management Inc. v. Switzerland*, Judgement of 26 November 2013, European Court of Human Rights (application No. 5809/08).

IV. Other activities

Notifications of listing

24. In accordance with paragraph 16 (b) of annex II to Security Council resolution 1989 (2011) and paragraph 18 (b) of annex II to Council resolution 2083 (2012), when an individual or entity is added to the list and relevant States have been notified, the Ombudsperson is to send a notification directly to that individual or entity if there is a known address.

25. In the six months since the sixth report was issued, four individuals and one entity have been added to the Al-Qaida sanctions list. The listings include an individual whose name was removed from the list and then was added again on the same day. Each of those listings was considered with reference to the question of notification. In three of the cases, no address was available or the information provided was insufficiently detailed for there to be any reasonable prospect of the notification reaching the addressee. In the fourth case, involving a delisting followed by an immediate listing, the Ombudsperson notified the listed person and his counsel.

Miscellaneous matters

26. The Ombudsperson continued to receive and respond to various inquiries about the Committee and the Ombudsperson process. This included requests for assistance and information from State representatives, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, lawyers, listed individuals, the media, academics, students and the general public.

V. Future work

27. As in previous reporting periods, the paramount activity of the Office of the Ombudsperson will continue to relate to the delisting requests. Two petitions were received during the most recent reporting period, a significant decline from the previous two reporting periods.[8] While some decrease is to be expected given the finite nature of the list, it is not possible to draw any conclusions as to future trends from the figures for the most recent period alone, since multiple factors influence the presentation of requests for delisting. For example, some listings are interrelated and it is evident that word of mouth plays a role in the dissemination of information about the process. As some recent petitions are related to other listings, concluding consideration of them could trigger further petitions. Moreover, recent experience has demonstrated that some listed persons and entities remain unaware of the Ombudsperson process. Efforts to disseminate information in that regard continue and may trigger additional applications in upcoming months.

28. Given these various factors, it is increasingly difficult to anticipate the future caseload with any certainty. On the basis of recent patterns of activity and taking these various factors into account, however, it is reasonable to assume that the Office of the Ombudsperson will receive approximately four requests in the next six-month period and that six cases will be active at the end of the next reporting period.

[8] Thirteen cases were submitted in the previous reporting period and six in the period before that.

29. Because of the continuing challenges associated with the lack of access to classified material, the development of arrangements or agreements for access to classified or confidential information will be the second priority for the Office of the Ombudsperson in the upcoming period. Renewed efforts will be made to raise the issue with States in order to enhance the ability of the Ombudsperson to gain access to critical information of relevance to delisting petitions.

30. The Office of the Ombudsperson has been operational for more than three and a half years. As a result, it is of increasing importance that procedural documents related to the Office be reviewed and revised to reflect experience and the realities of current practice. Such a review would constitute an important step forward in terms of institutionalizing practices, thereby avoiding difficulties during times of transition in the future. Furthermore, the high volume of cases considered during the past three and a half years has generated considerable information in terms of research and has led to factual findings and interpretations relevant for the future consideration of requests that raise similar issues. It is necessary to develop systems for better information management, including a searchable database. Such measures would strengthen the institutional memory of the Office and facilitate cross-referencing and research with regard to future cases involving overlapping facts, issues or applicable principles. This work too will be given priority.

31. Lastly, the Ombudsperson and her Office will continue to carry out outreach and liaison activities to the extent that resources permit, in order to make the process more visible and understandable to potential petitioners and other interested actors.

VI. Observations and conclusions

Due process

32. The Ombudsperson process continues to operate in compliance with the fundamental principles of fairness highlighted in previous reports.[9] Notably, in all cases completed during the reporting period, the petitioner was informed of the case underlying the listing and had an opportunity to respond and be heard by the decision maker through the Ombudsperson's comprehensive report. All Committee decisions on delisting petitions made during the reporting period were premised solely on information gathered by the Ombudsperson and followed her recommendation. In no case did the Committee take a decision by consensus contrary to the recommendation of the Ombudsperson and no matter was referred to the Security Council. As a result, each petitioner benefited from an effective, independent review of the basis for the listing and the information supporting it.

33. On one occasion, however, a petitioner's name was placed on the Al-Qaida sanctions list immediately after the Committee's decision to delist, with the result that the petitioner continues to be subject to the same sanctions measures. Given the proximity of the two decisions and the combined effect on the petitioner, the ramifications of this case for the fairness of the Ombudsperson process merit consideration.

[9] See in particular the detailed discussion in paragraphs 28-32 of the sixth report (S/2013/452).

34. The decision to relist was the result of a separate and independent decision of the Committee in which the Ombudsperson had no role. However, in a press release, the Committee stated that the decision had been taken on the basis of new information concerning recent support to Al-Qaida by the petitioner. That information was not available to the Ombudsperson when the comprehensive report was delivered to the Committee and was therefore not considered by the Committee when making its decision on the petition.[10]

35. The circumstances surrounding the relisting decision are significant in terms of the fairness of the Ombudsperson process. Although the Committee evidently received new information prior to the delisting, it did not rely on it in assessing and deciding on the petition. This is consistent with a fundamental fairness precept of the Ombudsperson process: that the Committee's decision be premised solely on the information gathered by the Ombudsperson as detailed in the comprehensive report. If the Committee were to rely on additional material not disclosed to the petitioner and scrutinized by the Ombudsperson, it would contravene the principles of fair process in terms of knowing and responding to the case, as well as effective independent review. Given that the new information played no part in the decision on the delisting petition, however, the Ombudsperson process in the specific case remained procedurally fair.

36. Particularly from the perspective of the petitioner, it is unfortunate that the Committee received new information at such a late stage in its consideration of that particular listing. Nonetheless, the possibility of new material surfacing late or even subsequent to delisting has always existed. While the timing is certainly regrettable, relisting on the basis of new information does not constitute an unfair procedure absent any other circumstances indicating to the contrary. Moreover, as the decision to list constitutes a new determination by the Committee, at least with respect to the Al-Qaida sanctions list, the petitioner has an immediate recourse available in that he can seek delisting through the Ombudsperson process. In this case, in accordance with paragraph 18 (b) of annex II to Security Council resolution 2083 (2012), the Ombudsperson has already notified the petitioner of the relisting and the availability of the Ombudsperson process.

37. The Ombudsperson is of the view that an independent decision to relist does not affect the fairness of the Ombudsperson process, in general or in this specific case. Thus, during the reporting period the Ombudsperson process continued to deliver, in the individual cases, a fair process.

Time frames

38. Another important factor when assessing the fairness of the process is its expeditiousness. Based on the current regime as mandated by the Security Council, the possible time frame for the consideration of a delisting request ranges from approximately 8 to 14 months.[11] Statistics show that in the three and a half years of operation of the Ombudsperson mechanism, the average time between the submission of a delisting request and the Committee's decision on the same has been just more than nine months. This number speaks for itself and is clearly a

[10] See www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2014/sc11241.doc.htm.

[11] These average numbers do not take account of the timing of the delivery of reasons (see below), as this requirement was adopted too recently with respect to granted delisting requests to be meaningfully assessed at this time.

testament to the fact that there is a focus on making the process as expeditious as possible.

Provision of reasons for delisting and retention

39. In its resolution 2083 (2012), the Security Council recognized the importance of reasons being part of a fair process by requiring such reasons to be provided to a petitioner whether the delisting request is accepted or refused. This represents a further advancement for the Ombudsperson process in terms of transparency and overall fairness.

40. In cases of delisting, however, the value of this improvement — for the petitioner and in terms of the transparency of process — has been diminished significantly by the extensive delays in communicating the reasons by the Committee and the relatively limited factual and analytical references provided. During the reporting period, reasons for the Committee's decision were communicated to petitioners in three cases. As at the time of writing the present report, however, reasons had not been provided in 14 cases. Several of the cases were decided months ago; in one instance, the decision was taken more than a year ago. While delayed delivery and limited content remains preferable to no reasons, the meaningfulness of communicating reasons in terms of the fairness of the process, especially in the perception of the petitioner, is reduced markedly by the passage of time.

41. On a practical level, the Ombudsperson advises the petitioner immediately of the decision to delist and the press release prepared by the Committee can be provided upon request. However, an official notification by the Ombudsperson to the petitioner cannot be sent until a formal communication has been provided by the Committee, with reasons. Delays in communicating the official decision only serve to exacerbate the general problems that petitioners face in obtaining implementation of the decision to delist. In that regard, in several instances delisted individuals have pointed to the absence of an official notification as the basis for difficulties faced in terms of travel or access to assets.

42. As mentioned in the sixth report, the problem with respect to reasons is not limited to cases of delisting. In accordance with the procedure set out by the Security Council, if the Ombudsperson recommends retaining the listing, the name of the sanctioned entity or individual will remain on the list, putting an end to further consideration of the delisting petition. While a Committee member disagreeing with the result can put forward a separate delisting request, that action will not affect the decision to reject the petitioner's original request. As a result, the listing is retained on the basis of the comprehensive report and the recommendation of the Ombudsperson. Under the current structure, however, the reasons for the decision are prepared by the Committee and conveyed to the Ombudsperson for transmission to the petitioner. There is therefore a real possibility that the reasons provided will not be consistent with the observations, analysis and findings of the Ombudsperson, introducing a fundamental unfairness into the process.

43. Experience to date supports the view that it is important, in terms of the fairness and transparency of the process, that reasons be provided. At the same time, it is clear that changes are needed to allow for the timely delivery of reasons and to ensure that the reasons are substantive in content and properly take into account the conclusions of the independent reviewer.

44. A partial solution could be to impose time constraints for the delivery of reasons. This would be consistent with the Ombudsperson process in general, which is governed throughout by strict deadlines. Such an approach fails to recognize the complexity of preparing reasons by the Committee, however, and may have the unintended consequence of further reducing the substantive content of the text.

45. A far more preferable and comprehensive solution would be to make the procedure for the provision of reasons consistent with the Ombudsperson process. In cases in which a listing is maintained on the basis of a recommendation by the Ombudsperson, it follows that the Ombudsperson should provide the reasons for that determination to the petitioner, with appropriate safeguards regarding the release of confidential material. This would ensure uniformity between the comprehensive report and the reasons and would be entirely in accord with the decision-making process in such circumstances.

46. Similarly, in delisting cases the Ombudsperson should be mandated to provide reasons based on the comprehensive report. While in such cases there is provision for the Committee to make a decision by consensus or through the application of paragraph 21 of resolution 2083 (2012), the final decision to delist would be in conformity with the recommendation of the Ombudsperson. That recommendation, in turn, would be premised on the information and analysis set out in the comprehensive report. As a result, the Ombudsperson is in the most advantageous position to prepare and provide reasons to the petitioner for the recommendation made, again with protections as regards any confidential material. In this context too, fairness dictates that the reasons provided to the petitioner should be consistent with the findings in the comprehensive report prepared by the independent reviewer. Importantly, given that the reasons can be clearly identified as being those of the Ombudsperson, the challenges that currently exist in relation to preparing the reasons when there is no consensus among Committee members would be overcome.

47. In cases of a Committee reversal or a Security Council decision, responsibility for providing reasons should be left to the Committee and the Council respectively.

48. In the view of the Ombudsperson, according responsibility for the delivery of reasons to the Ombudsperson would significantly enhance the fairness, transparency and efficiency of the process.

Mechanism for disclosing the reasons

49. There is another important consideration pertaining to the provision of reasons in the Ombudsperson process. As discussed in detail below, there is still limited transparency in the Ombudsperson procedure flowing mostly from the fact that the comprehensive report is not made available to interested States, the petitioner or the public. As a result, the reasoning of the Ombudsperson for arriving at a recommendation is not generally available. The sole exception is the information conveyed through the reasons, which are provided to the petitioner. This is the only mechanism established by the resolution through which it might be possible to disclose some of the factual information and findings in a case beyond the Office of the Ombudsperson and the Committee.

50. Currently, however, no means are specified in the resolution for those reasons to be publicly disclosed or even disseminated to clearly interested parties such as

States that are not members of the Committee, courts or national, regional and international bodies that might be implicated in particular cases. This is a significant lacuna in the process, the rationale for which is unclear. As the reasons are disclosed to the petitioner, who is free to disseminate them, there can be no question of confidentiality or protection of information. Moreover, a case-by-case approach is not satisfactory in this context, as the petitioner evidently should know from the beginning of the process how and to whom reasons will be disseminated. To the extent that there are concerns arising from a possible lack of consensus within the Committee, the proposal to mandate the Ombudsperson with the responsibility to prepare and disseminate the reasons for the recommendation made would address those apprehensions.

51. The absence from the resolution of a prescribed mechanism for disclosing reasons is evidently an issue in terms of transparency. It can also have practical ramifications for the effectiveness of the process, however, particularly at a time when there is increasing parallel consideration of individual cases at the national, regional and international levels. In this context, it is in the interest of fairness and the effectiveness of the sanctions measures that information on the decisions taken and the reasons for taking them be shared.

52. For all those reasons, consideration should be given to making public through the Ombudsperson process the reasons for removing or retaining a listing or, at least, to providing for the disclosure of information on those reasons to interested individuals, States or bodies.

Disclosure of the identity of the designating State

53. In paragraph 12 of its resolution 2083 (2012), the Security Council decided that States proposing names for inclusion in the Al-Qaida sanctions list should be the ones to specify if the Committee or the Ombudsperson may not make known their status as designating States. The Ombudsperson may therefore disclose the identity of the designating State absent a specific objection by that State.

54. During the reporting period, no State objected to the disclosure of its identity as a designating State. The fairness of the process has therefore been enhanced. It remains to be seen whether the absence of objections will continue to be the norm in future cases and what the effect of an objection would be.

Transparency of the process

55. Lack of transparency in the process continues to present the same challenges, as noted in other reports, with respect to the fairness and the credibility of the process as a whole. While the Security Council, by its resolution 2083 (2012), allows the Ombudsperson to disclose the recommendation to relevant States, the comprehensive report remains confidential, with the result that relevant States that are not members of the Committee are not aware of the information gathered, the analysis conducted or the basis for the recommendation.

56. Provided that there are protections in place for confidential material, it is difficult to rationalize why interested States that are not members of the Committee (in particular designating States or States of residence) are not given access to the comprehensive report. In each case, those States will have been fully implicated in the Ombudsperson process in terms of the provision of information and will be

expected to cooperate fully in that regard. Nevertheless, the State will ultimately receive no substantive information as to the basis for the recommendation made or the decision taken. It also creates obvious problems in terms of the relationship of cooperation between the Ombudsperson and the State. Moreover, in most cases, these are the States that ultimately will feel the effects of the decisions most directly and that will have important implementation responsibilities. In principle, it is evidently a practice that creates a significant inequality between States that are members of the Committee and States that are not, with reference to a sanctions regime in which all States are encouraged to participate. As such, in addition to the issues of lack of transparency and overall fairness, it appears to be counterproductive in terms of the effective implementation of the sanctions regime.

57. In some cases, the Committee's permission to disclose the report or parts thereof has been sought, especially where there could be damage to the Ombudsperson's ongoing relationship with the State. This is not a particularly satisfying solution, however, given that it provides no certainty to the relevant States or the petitioner as regards disclosure of information to such States. For all those reasons, consideration should be given to allowing for the comprehensive report to be disclosed to designating States, States of residence and nationality and any other relevant State.

58. The Ombudsperson cannot disclose the comprehensive report or her recommendation to the petitioner, who is thus left uninformed about the findings and final position of the Ombudsperson and about the analysis leading to that position, except, as discussed, to the extent that it is captured in any reasons provided. The petitioner, whose rights are directly affected by the sanctions measures and who will have been advised of the underlying information in the case, as far as possible, should have the opportunity to review and understand the findings and analysis of the Ombudsperson. Any confidential material in the report can easily be protected through the creation of a redacted version. To enhance the transparency and fairness of the Ombudsperson process, consideration should be given to a mechanism for disclosing the comprehensive report to the petitioner. At the very least, the Ombudsperson should be able to inform the petitioner of her recommendation at the same time as relevant States that are not members of the Committee are informed.

59. As to the public, only basic information on the process and the statistics related to the cases can be released. The overall lack of transparency for the general public undermines the fairness and credibility of the process as a whole. The most effective remedy would be to provide for public disclosure of the reports with proper measures in place to ensure the protection of confidential material.

Cooperation of States and specificity of information

60. State cooperation in terms of responses remained strong during the reporting period. As in the previous reporting period, all designating States and States of residence replied in the cases that were completed. The three States that did not respond were contacted as relevant States thought potentially to hold pertinent information. Of those States, one had only a remote link to the case and had previously indicated having no information on a related case. The other two faced internal circumstances that may well have precluded easy access to information from the authorities.

61. The reporting period was particularly fruitful in terms of the level of detail and thoroughness of information received in a number of cases, including confidential material in some instances. This allowed the Ombudsperson to fully assess the sufficiency, reasonableness and credibility of the underlying information in those cases. In a significant number of instances, however, the Ombudsperson received responses in the form of assertions lacking any level of detail or supporting information. As noted previously, this failing undermines the effectiveness of the overall process, including the dialogue with the petitioner. Most significantly, it has an impact on the Ombudsperson's ability to conduct a thorough analysis of the underlying information as an independent reviewer, to prepare a comprehensive report that properly reflects the facts of the case and to provide, in all circumstances, an appropriate recommendation.

62. The major impediment to the disclosure of detailed information remains the question of confidential or classified material despite some limited progress in individual cases. While no progress was made in terms of increasing the number of arrangements or agreements for gaining access to such material, discussions are ongoing with several States. Further progress on this issue is possible only if practical solutions can be found to overcome national access restrictions, especially with States that are frequently implicated in specific cases.

Mandate for the follow-up of delisting

63. Individuals and entities continue to inform the Ombudsperson of problems encountered in terms of continued restrictions following their delisting by the Committee, especially when they have not received formal notification of their delisting. Such follow-up requests fall outside the mandate of the Ombudsperson.

64. As noted in all previous reports, this presents a major threat to the principles of fairness and more generally to the credibility and effectiveness of the Al-Qaida sanctions regime. The improper, continued application of Security Council sanctions measures restricts fundamental rights to property and movement without any legal basis or justification. The current mechanism does not provide for any recourse in such cases. For these reasons and those expressed in the previous reports of the Ombudsperson (see S/2013/452, para. 55; S/2013/71, paras. 48-49; S/2012/590, para. 46; S/2012/49, para. 50; and S/2011/447, para. 47), consideration should be given to including in the mandate of the Ombudsperson the task of following up on claims of continued application of sanctions measures despite delisting.

Referral of cases to the Ombudsperson by the Committee

65. Currently, the Ombudsperson process is designed to address only those cases where an individual or entity or an appropriate representative brings an application for delisting. In cases in which a listing may no longer be appropriate, the Security Council, by its resolution 1822 (2008), mandated the Committee to conduct an annual review of all listings that had not been examined in three or more years. In this triennial review process, the Committee will endeavour to obtain the views of all relevant States in order to determine whether the listing remains appropriate. The States consulted may propose that the listing be maintained on the basis of information supporting the view that the criteria for listing continue to be met or bring an application for delisting after reviewing the case. Not all cases will fall into one of those two categories, however, because States may not take a clear position

one way or the other and/or the information provided may be insufficient or conflicting.

66. In its thirteenth and fourteenth reports to the Committee, the Monitoring Team recommended that the triennial review process be improved in that regard and that steps be taken to ensure that the Committee can take action in such circumstances. Specifically, it recommended that the Committee should proceed as if the designating State had requested delisting pursuant to paragraph 27 of resolution 1989 (2011),[12] unless the designating State argued for retention and provided detailed reasons in support (see S/2012/968, para. 24, and S/2013/467, para. 24).

67. As a complement to the proposal of the Monitoring Team, the Security Council could also consider the option of having the Committee refer the matter to the Office of the Ombudsperson in these circumstances. Thus, where no State objects or presents a delisting request or where the information submitted is insufficient or conflicting, the matter could be referred to the Office. The availability of referral to the Ombudsperson, which would entail an in-depth information-gathering process, might be particularly valuable in cases in which the Committee considers that it lacks the information necessary to make an informed decision.

68. The granting of such referral power to the Committee would have the effect of strengthening the effectiveness of the review process and enhancing the tools available to the Committee to assess the continued appropriateness of listings.

Assistance from staff members and independence

69. The Ombudsperson continues to be assisted in her work by a Legal Officer (P-4) and an Administrative Assistant. This assistance has been essential to the proper fulfilment of the mandate of the Ombudsperson, in particular given the caseload and the increasingly complex and challenging issues that have arisen in some instances.

70. The Secretariat, however, has recently decided that substantive trip reports must be submitted at the conclusion of any official travel undertaken by the staff members assisting the Ombudsperson. While this does not affect the Administrative Assistant, the Legal Officer has, on occasion, accompanied the Ombudsperson on her travels, in particular to assist with petitioner interviews. Despite assurances by the Secretariat that the reports will respect the confidentiality of the work, it is difficult to envisage how the content of any such report will not infringe on that confidentiality. Moreover, in principle, the establishment of a reporting line between the Office of the Ombudsperson and the Secretariat on substantive matters represents a direct and significant incursion into the independence of the Office, both in terms of perception and in practice. To safeguard that independence and to preserve the relationships of trust that underpin the effectiveness of the process, it will no longer be possible for the Legal Officer to participate in any operational travel. That restriction will need to remain in place as long as participation in any such travel triggers an obligation to report on substantive matters. This development is highly regrettable given the valuable assistance provided by the Legal Officer in this context. In addition, in some cases, it is evident that other resources — perhaps in the form of independent consultants — will have to be identified when it is essential for the Ombudsperson to have support during an official trip.

[12] Paragraph 27 of resolution 1989 (2011) is reflected in paragraph 26 of resolution 2083 (2012).

Conclusions

71. The Office of the Ombudsperson currently provides individuals and entities listed by the Committee with a fair and accessible recourse. In practice, the procedure set out by the Security Council for consideration of delisting petitions, through the Ombudsperson, meets the fundamental precepts of fairness and provides for an independent review of the factual information underlying the listings. The strict timelines and an expeditious approach in the handling of the cases further strengthen the effectiveness of the process. The Ombudsperson remains of the view that in each completed case to date the petitioner has benefited from a fair process.

72. Nonetheless, further steps can be taken to enhance the effectiveness of the process. It is imperative that increased access be provided to classified or confidential material concerning particular listings. This is the only means of ensuring that the Ombudsperson can deliver on the mandate to comprehensively consider the delisting case and provide a fully informed recommendation.

73. Changes are needed to the process by which reasons are delivered, both in the case of delisting and retention, to ensure timely delivery and substantive content that properly reflects the analysis and findings of the independent reviewer. Moreover, provision should be made for public disclosure of those reasons. On the same point, many challenges remain in terms of the general transparency of the procedures and in particular with respect to the disclosure of relevant information in the comprehensive report to the relevant States and the petitioner. Consideration also needs to be given to enhancing the role of the Ombudsperson in ensuring full implementation of the Committee's decisions to delist and to the possibility of according the Committee the power to refer to the Ombudsperson a case that would merit consideration through that process.

74. While there is room for further improvement, the Ombudsperson process continues to deliver a fair process and contribute to strengthening the effectiveness and credibility of the Al-Qaida sanctions regime of the Security Council.

Annex

Status of cases

Case 1, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
28 July 2010	Transmission of case 1 to the Committee
28 February 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision
1 September 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 2, Safet Ekrem Durguti (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 September 2010	Transmission of case 2 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 3, one entity (Status: delisting request withdrawn by petitioner)

Date	*Description*
3 November 2010	Transmission of case 3 to the Committee
14 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 August 2011	Withdrawal of petition

Case 4, Shafiq Ben Mohamed Ben Mohammed Al Ayadi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 December 2010	Transmission of case 4 to the Committee
29 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 October 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 5, Tarek Ben Al-Bechir Ben Amara Al-Charaabi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 December 2010	Transmission of case 5 to the Committee
26 April 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
31 May 2011	Presentation of the Comprehensive Report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 June 2011	Committee decision to delist
12 August 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 6, Abdul Latif Saleh (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
14 January 2011	Transmission of case 6 to the Committee
17 June 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
26 July 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 August 2011	Committee decision to delist
8 November 2011	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 7, Abu Sufian Al-Salamabi Muhammed Ahmed Abd Al-Razziq (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 January 2011	Transmission of case 7 to the Committee
23 September 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 November 2011	Committee decision to delist
13 February 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 8, Ahmed Ali Nur Jim'ale and 23 entities[a] (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
17 March 2011	Transmission of case 8 to the Committee
23 September 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2011	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 December 2011	Committee decision to delist six entities
21 February 2012	Committee decision to delist one individual and 17 entities
8 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

[a] Barakaat North America, Inc., Barakat Computer Consulting, Barakat Consulting Group, Barakat Global Telephone Company, Barakat Post Express, Barakat Refreshment Company, Al Baraka Exchange, LLC, Barakaat Telecommunications Co. Somalia, Ltd., Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Barako Trading Company, LLC, Al-Barakaat, Al-Barakaat Bank, Al-Barakaat Bank of Somalia, Al-Barakat Finance Group, Al-Barakat Financial Holding Co., Al-Barakat Global Telecommunications, Al-Barakat Group of Companies Somalia Limited, Al-Barakat International, Al-Barakat Investments, Barakaat Group of Companies, Barakaat Red Sea Telecommunications, Barakat International Companies and Barakat Telecommunications Company Limited.

Case 9, Saad Rashed Mohammed Al-Faqih and Movement for Reform in Arabia (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
19 April 2011	Transmission of case 9 to the Committee
21 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
13 November 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 10, Ibrahim Abdul Salam Mohamed Boyasseer (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 May 2011	Transmission of case 10 to the Committee
9 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 11, Mondher ben Mohsen ben Ali al-Baazaoui (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
1 June 2011	Transmission of case 11 to the Committee
19 January 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 March 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 March 2012	Committee decision to delist
10 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 12, Kamal ben Mohamed ben Ahmed Darraji (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
30 June 2011	Transmission of case 12 to the Committee
28 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
4 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 13, Fondation Secours Mondial (Status: amended[b])

Date	*Description*
7 July 2011	Transmission of case 13 to the Committee
14 December 2011	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
24 January 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
17 February 2012	Committee decision to amend
9 July 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

[b] Amended to be removed as an alias of Global Relief Foundation (QE.G.91.02.).

Case 14, Sa'd Abdullah Hussein al-Sharif (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
20 July 2011	Transmission of case 14 to the Committee
29 February 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
27 April 2012	Committee decision to delist
5 June 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 15, Fethi ben al-Rebei Absha Mnasri (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
4 August 2011	Transmission of case 15 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 16, Mounir Ben Habib Ben al-Taher Jarraya (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
15 August 2011	Transmission of case 16 to the Committee
9 March 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
17 April 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
2 May 2012	Committee decision to delist
3 August 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 17, Rachid Fettar (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
26 September 2011	Transmission of case 17 to the Committee
27 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 18, Ali Mohamed El Heit (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
5 October 2011	Transmission of case 18 to the Committee
2 May 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 July 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
19 July 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 19, Yassin Abdullah Kadi (listed as Yasin Abdullah Ezzedine Qadi) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
16 November 2011	Transmission of case 19 to the Committee
11 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
5 October 2012	Committee decision to delist

Case 20, Chabaane ben Mohamed ben Mohamed al-Trabelsi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
21 November 2011	Transmission of case 20 to the Committee
23 April 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
5 June 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 June 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 21, Adel Abdul Jalil Ibrahim Batterjee (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
3 January 2012	Transmission of case 21 to the Committee
10 October 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
14 January 2013	Committee decision to delist
5 September 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 22, Ibrahim ben Hedhili ben Mohamed al-Hamami (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
6 February 2012	Transmission of case 22 to the Committee
25 September 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
6 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
21 November 2012	Committee decision to delist
7 February 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 23, Suliman Hamd Suleiman Al-Buthe (Status: delisted) (Repeated request)

Date	*Description*
23 February 2012	Transmission of case 23 to the Committee
30 August 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
27 November 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
10 February 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 24, Mamoun Darkazanli (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 24 to the Committee
12 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
11 March 2013	Committee decision to delist
30 August 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 25, Abdullahi Hussein Kahie (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
28 February 2012	Transmission of case 25 to the Committee
26 July 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
10 September 2012	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
26 September 2012	Committee decision to delist
19 December 2012	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 26, Usama Muhammed Awad Bin Laden (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 21 February 2013

Date	*Description*
23 April 2012	Transmission of case 26 to the Committee
15 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 February 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 27, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
7 May 2012	Transmission of case 27 to the Committee
11 February 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
7 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
7 May 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
12 June 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 28, one individual (Status: denied)

Date	*Description*
7 June 2012	Transmission of case 28 to the Committee
20 November 2012	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
8 January 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
8 January 2013	Committee decision to retain listing
29 January 2013	Formal notification to petitioner with reasons

Case 29, Muhammad 'Abdallah Salih Sughayr (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 29 to the Committee
9 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
21 May 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
20 July 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 30, Lajnat Al Daawa Al Islamiya (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
25 July 2012	Transmission of case 30 to the Committee
15 April 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
2 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 September 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 31, Abd al Hamid Sulaiman Muhammed al-Mujil (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
1 August 2012	Transmission of case 31 to the Committee
13 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 June 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 32, Mohamed ben Mohamed ben Khalifa Abdelhedi (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
19 September 2012	Transmission of case 32 to the Committee
5 March 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
16 April 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
1 May 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 33, Mohammed Daki (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
12 October 2012	Transmission of case 33 to the Committee
28 May 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
30 July 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
16 August 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 34, Abdelghani Mzoudi (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 18 March 2013

Date	*Description*
8 November 2012	Transmission of case 34 to the Committee
18 March 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 35, international Islamic Relief Organization, Philippines, branch offices (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 35 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 36, International Islamic Relief Organization, Indonesia, branch office (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 December 2012	Transmission of case 36 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

Case 37, Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah (Status: delisted)[c]

Date	*Description*
4 February 2013	Transmission of case 37 to the Committee
5 September 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
1 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 January 2014	Committee decision to delist

[c] Jaber Abdullah Jaber Ahmed Al-Jalahmah was relisted on the same date by a separate Committee decision.

Case 38, Moustafa Abbas (listed as Moustafa Abbes) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 38 to the Committee
12 August 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 September 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
30 September 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 39, Atilla Selek (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
13 February 2013	Transmission of case 39 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 40, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

Date	*Description*
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 40 to the Committee
14 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 41, L'hadi Bendebka (listed as Abdelhadi Ben Debka) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
12 March 2013	Transmission of case 41 to the Committee
14 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
3 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
18 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 42, Youcef Abbas (listed as Youcef Abbes) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
4 March 2013	Transmission of case 42 to the Committee
2 October 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
15 November 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
3 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 43, Said Yousef AbouAziz (listed as Said Youssef Ali Abu Aziza) (Status: delisted)
Ombudsperson case became moot following the Committee's decision of 26 August 2013

Date	*Description*
27 March 2013	Transmission of case 43 to the Committee
26 August 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 44, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

Date	*Description*
2 May 2013	Transmission of case 44 to the Committee
4 February 2014	Deadline for completion of the dialogue phase

Case 45, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

Date	*Description*
6 May 2013	Transmission of case 45 to the Committee
9 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 46, one individual (Status: Committee phase)

Date	*Description*
10 May 2013	Transmission of case 46 to the Committee
30 December 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee

Case 47, Nabil Benatia (listed as Nabil ben Mohamed ben Ali ben Attia) (Status: delisted)

Date	*Description*
3 June 2013	Transmission of case 47 to the Committee
12 November 2013	Comprehensive report submitted to the Committee
13 December 2013	Presentation of the comprehensive report by the Ombudsperson to the Committee
31 December 2013	Committee decision to delist

Case 48, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

Date	*Description*
17 June 2013	Transmission of case 48 to the Committee
20 March 2014	Deadline for completion of the dialogue phase

Case 49, one individual (Status: dialogue phase)

Date	*Description*
24 June 2013	Transmission of case 49 to the Committee
3 April 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase

Case 50, one entity (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
5 September 2013	Transmission of case 50 to the Committee
28 February 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase

Case 51, one individual (Status: information-gathering phase)

Date	*Description*
28 October 2013	Transmission of case 51 to the Committee
28 February 2014	Deadline for completion of the information-gathering phase